arXiv:1602.01903v1 [math.NT] 5 Feb 2016

A double-inductive proof of Moessner's theorem

Archy Wilhes

February 8, 2016

Abstract

We present a proof of Moessner's theorem by double induction, using only basic rules of arithmetic. No prerequisite knowledge is assumed.

1 Introduction

Suppose we have a stream of positive integers:

$$1, 2, 3, 4, 5....$$

For any natural number n, remove every $x := (n+2)$-th element and then forms a new stream by doing partial sum on the resulted stream. Repeat the removal-then-new-stream-formation process for n times with x decreases by 1 each time and we would obtain a new stream

$$1, M(0,n), M(1,n), M(2,n), M(3,n)...$$

where

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}\, \forall k \in \mathbb{N} \quad M(k,n) = (k+2)^{n+2}$$

This is one way of expressing Moessner's theorem.

To get the intuition behind it, let us start off by dropping every second number in a stream of positive integers. We obtain the stream

$$1, 3, 5, 7, 9...$$

which is a stream of odd numbers. If we construct a new stream by partial summation on this stream, the resulting stream is that of square numbers

$$1, 4, 9, 16, 25...$$

Intriguing. A curious soul may now be tempted to ask, "What if we are to begin with dropping every third number, constructing a new stream by partial summation, then dropping every second number in that stream, and constructing a new stream again by partial summation?" Interestingly, the resulting stream would then be the stream of cube numbers

$$1, 8, 27, 64, 125...$$

Moessner conjectured [1] that the procedure above can be generalized into obtaining the stream

$$1^n, 2^n, 3^n, 4^n, 5^n ...$$

if the procedure is began by dropping every n-th number, and this was what would later be known as Moessner's theorem, after first proven by Perron [2]. Moessner's theorem has been sequently proven by many others such as Paasche [3], Long [4], Hinze [5], Niqui and Rutten [6], and Kozen and Silva [7].

In this article we present a new proof for Moessner's theorem by double induction, using only basic rules of arithmetic. No prerequisite knowledge is assumed. Familiarity with summation is advised for page 7.

Throughout the article the predicate $\phi_M(k, n)$ would be used to express that the theorem holds for some k and n i.e.,

$$\phi_M(k, n) \Leftrightarrow M(k, n) = (k + 2)^{n+2}$$

and the procedure described in the first paragraph to obtain

$$1, M(0, n), M(1, n), M(2, n), M(3, n)...$$

would be refer red to as *Moessner's Sieve*.

2 An inductive proof for $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}\ M(0, n) = 2^{n+2}$

It is easy to see that the base case (n=0) holds i.e, $M(0, 0) = 2^2 = 4 \wedge 1+3 = 4$. We now demonstrate that $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}\ \phi_M(0, n) \Rightarrow \phi_M(0, n+1)$ by showing that

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N} \quad M(0, n + 1) = M(0, n) + M(0, n)$$

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, by *Moessner's Sieve*, $M(0, n)$ is equivalent to the sum of $A_n \coloneqq (n + 2) + 1$ and B_n where B_n is the sum of the numbers below:

$$\begin{aligned} &f_0(0), f_0(1), f_0(2) \ ... \ f_0(n) \\ &f_1(0), f_1(1) \ ... \ f_1(n - 1) \\ &... \\ &f_n(0) \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

with f_m defined recursively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} f_0(x) &= x + 1 \\ \forall m \in \mathbb{N} \quad f_{m+1}(x) &= \sum_{a=0}^{x} f_m(a) \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Here A_n represents the number in the original stream that would eventually become $M(0, n)$ after *Moessner's Sieve*, and B_n describes the addition on A_n during the *Moessner's Sieve*: every m-th row (starting from 0-th and ending at k-th) denotes the list of $(n - m)$ numbers to be added to A_n at the m-th partial sum. (The partial sum before any removal-then-new-stream-formation process is referred to as the 0-th partial sum.)

Now let us shift our attention to $M(0, n+1)$, which is equivalent to the sum of $A_{n+1} \coloneqq A_n + 1$ and B_{n+1} where B_{n+1} is the numbers below:

$$\begin{aligned} &f_0(0), f_0(1), f_0(2) \ ... \ f_0(n+1) \\ &f_1(0), f_1(1) \ ... \ f_1(n) \\ &... \\ &f_{n+1}(0) \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

We observe that B_n and B_{n+1} differ in that B_{n+1} has an extra diagonal colored in red as shown below:

$$\begin{aligned} &f_0(0), f_0(1), f_0(2) \ ... \ f_0(n), f_0(n+1) \\ &f_1(0), f_1(1) \ ... \ f_1(n-1), f_1(n) \\ &... \\ &f_n(0), f_n(1) \\ &f_{n+1}(0) \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

For any n, this extra diagonal is equivalent to V_n where

$$V_n = \sum_{a=0}^{n+1} f_a(n+1-a) \tag{5}$$

and by (1) and (2)

$$V_n = f_0(n+1) + B_n \tag{6}$$

Considering that $f_0(n+1) + 1 = A_n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} M(0, n+1) - M(0, n) &= (A_{n+1} - A_n) + (B_{n+1} - B_n) \\ &= 1 + V_n \\ &= A_n + B_n \\ &= M(0, n) \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

By demonstrating that $M(0,0) = 2^2$ and $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} \ M(0, n+1) = M(0, n) + M(0, n)$ hold, we have inductively showed that

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N} \ M(0, n) = 2^{n+2}$$

as a result of the definitions of multiplication (i.e., $x + x = 2x$) and exponentiation (i.e. $x^n \cdot x = x^{n+1}$).

3 An inductive proof for $\forall k \in \mathbb{N} \ M(k, 0) = (k+2)^n$

The base case (k=0) is the same as that in the previous induction. We are left with demonstrating that $\forall k \in \mathbb{N} \ \phi_M(k, 0) \Rightarrow \phi_M(k+1, 0)$.

After removing every 2nd element in the original stream, we are left with a stream of odd numbers i.e.,

$$1, 3, 5, 7, 9...$$

Every number in the stream starting from the 3rd (i.e., 5) can be expressed as $2(k+2)+1$, with k starts from 0. After the partial sum, we would obtain a new stream

$$1, M(0,0), M(1,0), M(2,0), M(3,0)...$$

where

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N} \quad M(k+1,0) = M(k,0) + 2(k+2) + 1 \tag{8}$$

Therefore we can conclude that

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}\ M(k,0) = (k+2)^2$$

as a result of the simple fact that $(a+b)^2 = a^2 + 2ab + b^2$.

4 Our main dish of the day

If we lay out all instances of $\phi_M(n,k)$ nicely on a piece of paper we would have

$$\begin{array}{l}
\phi_M(0,0)\ \phi_M(1,0)\ \phi_M(2,0)\ \phi_M(3,0)\ \phi_M(4,0)\ ... \\
\phi_M(0,1)\ \phi_M(1,1)\ \phi_M(2,1)\ \phi_M(3,1)\ \phi_M(4,1)\ ... \\
\phi_M(0,2)\ \phi_M(1,2)\ \phi_M(2,2)\ \phi_M(3,2)\ \phi_M(4,2)\ ... \\
\phi_M(0,3)\ \phi_M(1,3)\ \phi_M(2,3)\ \phi_M(3,3)\ \phi_M(4,3)\ ... \\
\phi_M(0,4)\ \phi_M(1,4)\ \phi_M(2,4)\ \phi_M(3,4)\ \phi_M(4,4)\ ... \\
..... \\
\end{array}$$

where the instances colored in blue have been proven. By demonstrating that

$$\phi_M(k,n) \wedge \phi_M(k+1,n) \wedge \phi_M(k,n+1) \Rightarrow \phi_M(k+1,n+1)$$

i.e., for any predicate colored in black above, it is true if its top, left, and top-left neighboring predicates are true, we would cover the entire space and inductively prove that $\phi_M(n,k)$ holds for all n and k in $\mathbb{N}$.

We start off by making the observation that, by *Moessner's Sieve*, $M(k,n)$ is equivalent to the sum of $A_n^k \coloneqq (k+1)(n+2)+1$ and $B_n^k \coloneqq \sum_{i=0}^{k} \Delta_n^i$ where Δ_n^i is the sum of the numbers below

$$\begin{array}{l}
g_0^i(0,n), g_0^i(1,n), g_0^i(2,n)\ ...\ g_0^i(n,n) \\
g_1^i(0,n), g_1^i(1,n)\ ...\ g_1^i(n-1,n) \\
... \\
g_n^i(0,n)
\end{array} \tag{9}$$

with g_m^i being a generalization of f_m in (1), defined recursively as follows

$$\begin{array}{c}
g_0^i(x,n) = i \cdot (n+2) + x + 1 \\
\forall m \in \mathbb{N} \quad g_{m+1}^i(x,n) = (\sum_{a=0}^{x} g_m^i(a,n)) + \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \sum_{a=0}^{n-m} g_m^j(a,n)
\end{array} \tag{10}$$

Here A_n^k and B_n^k have the same respective interpretations just as A_n and B_n above. (Note that $g_m^0(x,n) = f_m(x)$ and that $\sum_{j=0}^{i-1}\sum_{a=0}^{n-m} g_m^j(a,n)$ is simply the sum of the numbers in the first $(n-m)$ rows in all the Δ_n^j that come before Δ_n^i. In the case when i is 0, there wouldn't be any Δ_n^j, so we don't see the addition of this guy in (2) for the definition of f_m.)

For any n and k in $\mathbb{N}$, by *Moessner's Sieve*, it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} M(k+1,n) - M(k,n) &= (A_n^{k+1} - A_n^k) + (B_n^{k+1} - B_n^k) \\ &= (n+2) + \Delta_n^{k+1} \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

It is also clear that, if $\phi_M(k,n)$ and $\phi_M(k,n+1)$ are true, we have

$$\begin{aligned} M(k,n+1) - M(k,n) &= (k+2)^{n+3} - (k+2)^{n+2} \\ &= M(k,n)\cdot(k+1) \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Assuming $\phi_M(k,n)$ and $\phi_M(k,n+1)$, by (12) we have $M(k,n) = M(k,n+1) - M(k,n)\cdot(k+1)$, and by (11), we can see that

$$\begin{aligned} &M(k+1,n+1) - M(k,n) \\ &= ((n+3) + \Delta_{n+1}^{k+1}) + M(k,n)\cdot(k+1) \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

On the other hand, assuming $\phi_M(k+1,n)$, by (12) and (11), if

$$\begin{aligned} &M(k+1,n+1) - M(k,n) \\ &= ((n+2) + \Delta_n^{k+1}) + M(k+1,n)\cdot(k+2) \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

holds, $M(k+1,n+1) = M(k+1,n) + M(k+1,n)\cdot(k+2))$ holds, i.e., $\phi_M(k+1,n+1)$ is true. We now present a proof for

$$\begin{aligned} &((n+3) + \Delta_{n+1}^{k+1}) + M(k,n)\cdot(k+1) \\ &= ((n+2) + \Delta_n^{k+1}) + M(k+1,n)\cdot(k+2) \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

assuming only $\phi_M(k,n)$, $\phi_M(k,n+1)$ and $\phi_M(k+1,n)$.

We start off by simplifying the expression into

$$\Delta_{n+1}^{k+1} - \Delta_n^{k+1} = M(k+1,n)\cdot(k+2) - M(k,n)\cdot(k+1) - 1 \tag{16}$$

and we make the observation that Δ_{n+1}^{k+1} and Δ_n^{k+1} differ in that every g_m^{k+1} takes in $n+1$ instead of n in the second parameter, and that there is an extra diagonal (similar to (4)) in Δ_{n+1}^{k+1}:

$$\begin{aligned} &g_0^{k+1}(0,n+1), g_0^{k+1}(1,n+1), g_0^{k+1}(2,n+1) \ldots g_0^{k+1}(n,n+1), g_0^{k+1}(n+1,n+1) \\ &g_1^{k+1}(0,n+1), g_1^{k+1}(1,n+1) \ldots g_1^{k+1}(n-1,n+1), g_1^{k+1}(n,n+1) \\ &\ldots \\ &g_n^{k+1}(0,n+1), g_n^{k+1}(1,n+1) \\ &g_{n+1}^{k+1}(0,n+1) \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

The difference between Δ_{n+1}^{k+1} and Δ_n^{k+1} is thus, by the *Moessner's Sieve*, the sum of V_{n+1}^{k+1} and H_n^{k+1}, where V_{n+1}^{k+1} accounts for the extra diagonal (with n being the second parameter in g_m^{k+1}), and H_{n+1}^{k+1} accounts for the differences between all $g_m^{k+1}(a, n+1)$ and $g_m^{k+1}(a, n)$ (including those inside the diagonal):

$$V_n^{k+1} = \sum_{a=0}^{n+1} g_a^{k+1}(n+1-a, n) \tag{18}$$

and H_n^{k+1} is the sum of the numbers below,

$$\begin{aligned} &h_0^{k+1}(0,n), h_0^{k+1}(1,n), h_0^{k+1}(2,n) \ ... \ h_0^{k+1}(n+1,n) \\ &h_1^{k+1}(0,n), h_1^{k+1}(1,n) \ ... \ h_1^{k+1}(n,n) \\ &... \\ &h_{n+1}^{k+1}(0,n) \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where

$$h_m^i = g_m^i(x, n+1) - g_m^i(x, n) \tag{20}$$

Similar to (6), by (9) and (10),

$$V_n^{k+1} = g_0^{k+1}(n+1, n) + \sum_{i=0}^{k+1} \Delta_n^i \tag{21}$$

Considering that $g_0^{k+1}(n+1, n) + 1 = A_n^{k+1}$, we have

$$V_n^{k+1} = M(k+1, n) - 1 \tag{22}$$

Since $\Delta_{n+1}^{k+1} - \Delta_n^{k+1} = V_n^{k+1} + H_n^{k+1}$, (16) can be further reduced into

$$\begin{aligned} H_n^{k+1} &= (M_n^{k+1} - M_n^k) \cdot (k+1) \\ &= ((n+2) + \Delta_n^{k+1}) \cdot (k+1) \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

It is easy to see that $g_0^i(x, n+1) - g_0^i(x, n) = i$ holds for any $x, n, i \in \mathbb{N}$, so the sum of the first row of numbers in H_n^{k+1} is $(n+1) \cdot (k+1)$. We now demonstrate that the bottom n rows sums up to $\Delta_n^{k+1} \cdot (k+1)$. We observe that, for any $x, n, i, m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$h_{m+1}^i(x, n) = g_m^i(x, n) \cdot i \tag{24}$$

holds, and we give an inductive proof for it. Let $m = 0$ be the base case:

$$\begin{aligned}
g_1^i(x, n+1) - g_1^i(x, n) =& \{\text{by the defintion of } g\ \} (\sum_{a=0}^{x} i) + (\sum_{j=0}^{i-1}(\sum_{a=0}^{n+1} j) + g_0^j(n+1, n)) \\
&= (x+1) \cdot i + (\sum_{j=0}^{i-1}(j \cdot (n+2)) + (j \cdot (n+2) + (n+2))) \\
&= (x+1) \cdot i + (\sum_{j=0}^{i-1}(n+2) \cdot (2 \cdot j + 1)) \\
&= (x+1) \cdot i + ((n+2) \cdot i \cdot \frac{2 \cdot i + 1 - 1}{2}) \\
&= (x+1) \cdot i + ((n+2) \cdot i \cdot i) \\
&= ((x+1) + (n+2) \cdot i) \cdot i \\
&= g_0^i(x, n) \cdot i
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

The base case is shown to hold. All is left is to demonstrate that $(h_{m+1}^i(x, n) = g_m^i(x, n) \cdot i) \Rightarrow (h_{m+2}^i(x, n) = g_{m+1}^i(x, n) \cdot i)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& g_{m+2}^i(x, n+1) - g_{m+2}^i(x, n) \\
&= (\sum_{a=0}^{x}(g_{m+1}^i(a, n+1) - g_{m+1}^i(a, n))) + (\sum_{j=0}^{i-1}(\sum_{a=0}^{n-m} g_{m+1}^j(a, n+1) - g_{m+1}^j(a, n)) + g_{m+1}^j(n-m, n)) \\
& \{\text{by the induction hypothesis}\} \\
&= (\sum_{a=0}^{x} g_m^i(a, n) \cdot i) + (\sum_{j=0}^{i-1}(\sum_{a=0}^{n-m} g_m^j(a, n) \cdot j) + g_{m+1}^j(n-m, n)) \\
&= (\sum_{a=0}^{x} g_m^i(a, n) \cdot i) + (\sum_{j=0}^{i-1}(\sum_{a=0}^{n-m} g_m^j(a, n) \cdot j)) + (\sum_{j=0}^{i-1} g_{m+1}^j(n-m, n)) \\
&= (\sum_{a=0}^{x} g_m^i(a, n) \cdot i) + (\sum_{j=0}^{i-1}(\sum_{a=0}^{n-m} g_m^j(a, n) \cdot j)) + (\sum_{j=0}^{i-1}(\sum_{a=0}^{n-m} g_m^j(a, n) \cdot (i-j))) \\
&= (\sum_{a=0}^{x} g_m^i(a, n) \cdot i) + (\sum_{j=0}^{i-1}\sum_{a=0}^{n-m} g_m^j(a, n) \cdot i) \\
&= g_{m+1}^i(x, n) \cdot i
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where $\sum_{j=0}^{i-1} g_{m+1}^j(n-m, n) = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1}\sum_{a=0}^{n-m} g_m^j(a, n) \cdot (i-j)$ can be shown as

follows

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=0}^{i-1} g_{m+1}^{j}(n-m,n) =& \{\text{by the defintion of } g\ \} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1}(\sum_{a=0}^{n-m} g_m^j(a,n) + \sum_{u=0}^{j-1}\sum_{a=0}^{n-m} g_m^u(a,n)) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{i-1}\sum_{a=0}^{n-m}(g_m^j(a,n) + \sum_{u=0}^{j-1} g_m^u(a,n)) \\ &= \sum_{a=0}^{n-m}\sum_{j=0}^{i-1}\sum_{u=0}^{j} g_m^u(a,n)) \\ &= \sum_{a=0}^{n-m}\sum_{u=0}^{i-1}\sum_{j=u}^{i-1} g_m^u(a,n)) \\ &= \sum_{a=0}^{n-m}\sum_{u=0}^{i-1} g_m^u(a,n)\cdot(i-u)\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Therefore, $h_{m+1}^{i}(x,n) = g_m^i(x,n)\cdot i$ holds and we obtain

$$H_n^{k+1} = (n+2)\cdot(k+1) + \Delta_n^{k+1}\cdot(k+1) \tag{28}$$

proving that (23) holds, and therefore (15) holds, consequently indicating that

$$M(k+1,n+1) - M(k+1,n) = M(k+1,n)\cdot(k+2)$$

holds assuming only $\phi_M(k,n)$, $\phi_M(k,n+1)$ and $\phi_M(k+1,n)$, i.e.,

$$\forall n,k\in\mathbb{N} \quad \phi_M(k,n)\wedge\phi_M(k+1,n)\wedge\phi_M(k,n+1)\Rightarrow\phi_M(k+1,n+1)$$

Q.E.D

References

[1] Moessner, A. *Eine Bemerkung ber die Potenzen der natrlichen Zahlen.* Aus den Sitzungsberichten der Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Mathematisch-naturwissenschaftliche Klasse 1951 Nr. 3 (1951)

[2] Perron, O. *Beweis des Moessnerschen Satz.* Aus den Sitzungsberichten der Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Mathematisch-naturwissenschaftliche Klasse 1951 Nr. 4, (1951)

[3] Paasche, I. *Ein neuer Beweis des moessnerischen Satzes.* Sitzungsberichten der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Mathematischnaturwissenschaftliche Klasse 1952, 1:1-5 (1953).

[4] Long, C. T. *On the Moessner's theorem on integral powers.* Amer. Math. Monthly, 73(8):846-851, October (1966)

[5] Hinze, R. *Scans and convolutions - a calculational proof of Moessner's theorem.* In Post-proceedings of the 20th International Symposium on the Implementation and Application of Functional Languages (IFL '08), volume 5836 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science (2009)

[6] Niqui, M. and Rutten, J.J.M.M. *An exercise in coinduction: Moessner's theorem.* Technical Report SEN-1103, CWI Amsterdam (2011)

[7] Kozen, D. and Silva, A. *On Moessner's Theorem.* (2011)